E458
.4
.W15

0 012 028 372 8

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F3-1955

E 458
.4
.W15
Copy 1

"UNION" ON DIS-UNION PRINCIPLES

THE CHICAGO PLATFORM,
McCLELLAN'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE,
And PENDLETON'S HASKIN LETTER,

Reviewed & Exposed

A SPEECH DELIVERED

By ABRAM WAKEMAN, of New-York,

AT GREENFIELD HILL, CONN., NOV. 3, 1864.

MR. WAKEMAN was received with applause, and said:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I thank you most heartily for your kind reception, and I think I can repay it best by proceeding at once to the subject I propose to take in hand. That will be to find out the real meaning of the Chicago Platform, McClellan's Letter of Acceptance, and Pendleton's Haskin Letter.

The necessity of doing this appears from the

IMPORTANCE OF POLITICAL PARTIES.

We are told that in our country the people rule, but the more practical and important truth is that they rule only by political Parties. The *party* that has the majority at a Presidential Election governs for the next four years, and cannot be changed. In England the Executive is dependent upon the House of Commons, and must resign as soon as it looses its majority there. Our President is fixed in his term of office, and is independent of Congress—nay, unless it have a majority of two-thirds against him, he can control it by his veto. But there is one thing that he cannot control—one thing that dictates his measures, his appointments, and makes him all that he is—that is, his *political party*. Upon that he must rely or have no support at all.

The Nominee that kicks the Platform of his *Party* from under him must fall from want of support as soon as he reaches the realities of government; he cannot hold himself up by his own waist-band in politics any more than he could in the circus.

E458
.4
.W15

John Tyler, you remember, made the attempt, and it nearly convulsed the country in times of profound peace. Instead of being the powerful and respected "Tyler too" that he was when elected, his position became so ridiculous and impotent that it is certain he will never have an imitator.

We cannot but see, then, that the personal claims or merits of candidates, and our preferences for, or prejudices against them, are of little moment. Our country's fate depends upon the policy, principles and instincts of the *party* that will control it for the next four years. *It is our country's future and not men that we are electing!*

The Principles and Policy of the so-called Democratic Party were in grand National Convention, August 30, 1864, unanimously embodied in the Chicago Platform. Mr. Vallandigham was the active man of the Committee that framed it, and he it was who moved that Gen. McClellan be unanimously placed upon it as their and its candidate—to execute it if elected.

It is our duty, then, to scan this Platform closely. It was built by astute lawyers and politicians, who weighed and measured every word. It is the indictment of the Convention against President Lincoln's Administration. But above all, if adopted, it will be the future history of our country. It is the chart by which their party proposes to steer our noble old ship of State through the storms and breakers of civil war.

Let us, then, turn up each of its six planks and see if its timber will stand the fearful test.

THE FIRST PLANK IS THIS:

Resolved, That in the future, as in the past, we will adhere with unswerving fidelity to *the Union under the Constitution*, * * * * * * * * * as the only solid foundation of our strength, security, and happiness as a people, and as *a framework of government* equally conducive to the welfare and prosperity *of all the States, both Northern and Southern.*

If they have the same understanding of words that the loyal people and democracy have, there would seem to be nothing objectionable in this plank. But notice, they only say, "*we will adhere.*" The Southern half of the so-called Democratic party refused to "adhere." Does the portion of the party now in the loyal States propose to compel them to submit to the constitution as it is?

The history of the plank throws light on this question. It was offered in their full Convention by Ex-Gov. Washington Hunt, of this State, an old line whig, who it seems was there playing the part of the goose among cranes, and very soon was he stripped of his patriotic feathers. As he offered the resolution it read, "Union *and* Constitution *and insist on maintaining the national unity*," &c. The resolution with these invaluable words in it was referred to the Committee on the Platform. Neither grammar nor style required these words to be changed, but the word "*and*" was changed to "*under*," and the whole clause "*insisting upon maintaining the national unity*," *was stricken out, and THEN* it was adopted by the Convention and is their first plank.

Why was this patriotic clause stricken out? The "*national unity*" is the very point at issue between us and Rebels in arms. These Rebels are principally Southern Democrats, who refused to "adhere" to the Constitution, and are now making desperate efforts to destroy it by arms. Why is it that their old political associates refuse to insist upon maintaining the national unity?

Do not these people propose to sit still and "adhere with unswerving fidelity" to the ship that floats them, while rebel pirates scuttle and send her adrift?

Why, then, do the Convention use the word "adhere," why change "Union *and* the Constitution" to "Union *under* the Constitution"—why speak of "the welfare and prosperity of all *the States*, both Northern and Southern?"—why *strike out* the clause to "maintain the national unity?

It is because they have adopted the rebel theory of the constitution! What that is will appear from a moment's glance at

THE TRUE THEORY OF OUR GOVERNMENT.

The old and true doctrine was and is, that the Constitution of the United States is the CHARTER by which THE PEOPLE formed and ordained a *National Government*, to which, every man, woman and child owes allegiance. That the laws and treaties made in pursuance thereof are paramount to, and above, all state constitutions and laws. This national Constitution binds together indissolubly the people individually, and also the states, *both having joined to form it and give it life.* No individual, nor state, nor number of individuals, acting as a state legislature or convention can break the governmental bond thus entered into, or absolve the allegiance of any person or state from this national government—called the "United States of America." The States exercise all the functions of government not provided for in the Constitution, particularly functions relating to local or domestic affairs.

The President is required by his oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. He has under him for this purpose an army and navy, and is expressly empowered to put down insurrections and rebellions.

This national government is Republican in form, and by the Constitution is made to guarantee a Republican form of government to each state; and in time of peace, to protect every individual in his life, liberty and property, except when arrested for crime.

This is the most perfect government the human race has ever yet achieved. It rests on three firm pillars.

1. DEMOCRACY, securing individual liberty and equality before the law.

2. REPUBLICANISM, by which the citizens frame and administer their own government and laws in state and nation.

3. A NATIONAL GOVERNMENT *of unity and strength*, protecting the liberty and democracy of the people and guaranteeing the Republicanism of the states, against foreign nations and rebels and traitors at home.

History shows us governments, in all ages, resting upon one or the other of these pillars, but never before were they made to stand *together* as the supports of one *Grand Republic* securing individual liberty—a government by the people, and a *Union* of national power superior to the mightiest monarchy. But this is not all. It is capable of unlimited extension. Its states controlling local affairs, and the national government binding them and their people into *one nation*—the more it includes, the stronger it is. Unlike the Roman empire, it may be safely extended—by annexation of states, without breaking, until it includes all the people of this continent, and perhaps, in future ages, all the people of the whole world!

Time reserved the founding of this magnificent structure for a new hemisphere, and a people selected from all nations.

God grant that the crime of letting it fall to pieces may not rest upon us!

THE REBEL OR CHICAGO THEORY OF OUR GOVERNMENT

is told in a few words.

The southern colonies, unlike the northern, were settled by aristocrats, adventurers and convicts. Neither of these classes would work if they could help it. Those that could, therefore, procured slaves. As the country grew, slavery grew, and those who held slaves became the aristocrats. The first result was that all true democracy, all free labor, all equality among the people vanished. The states then changed from republics to oligarchies, controlled by slave-owners. The non-slaveholders being the dependents of, and voters for, the oligarchs.

Thus democracy and republicanism were destroyed. The next attack was upon the "*national unity.*" They controlled the slave states. States rights were, therefore, the only political power they could make the basis of their movement. Calhoun was their leader. Seizing upon some loose expressions in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798, and wresting them from the meaning affixed to them by Madison, their author, Calhoun asserted *that the States* still remained *sovereign* and *independent.* That the constitution was only a compact or treaty between them, by which they delegated certain duties to a general government, which was the creature and agent of the states, and from which they might secede at will.

The States thus *formed* a "Union *under* the Constitution." They denied that *the people* by *the Constitution* formed "the Union" as a national government, binding alike on the people and the states.

The slavery-based aristocracy made their first attack under this theory in South Carolina, in 1833, under Calhoun, for the purpose of nullifying the tariff.

President Jackson expressed his determination to hang Calhoun upon the first overt act. Would that he had! Who can estimate the blood, the suffering, and treasure it would have saved us?

Henry Clay, unfortunately, stepped in with a compromise, and the glorious opportunity of crushing the monster *Secession* in its infancy was lost.

Both Jackson and Webster regretted that the power of the government was not then brought to a test and vindicated. The conspirator Calhoun was baffled, not defeated. He and the Southern aristocracy commenced to educate the Southern youth and the Democratic party of the whole Union. He was successful at the South and partially so at the North. The changes were rung first on the RESOLUTIONS OF '98, then on STATE RIGHTS, then on STATE SOVEREIGNTY, then on the RIGHT OF SECESSION, until the pillar of NATIONAL UNITY was undermined and ready to fall. His political descendants at the Charleston Convention purposely broke up the Democratic party, in order that a pretext might be had in the election of President Lincoln, and then the rebellion threw off disguise and took up arms.

Now, when you see men decline to pledge themselves "to maintain the National unity," and hear them talk of "adhering" to a "Union *under* the Constitution," and when they say nothing about our national glory and prosperity, but are careful and jealous of the "welfare of the States Northern and Southern." You may judge at once by these stray feathers what bird they follow. You may be sure it is not our National American Eagle, but that low nauseous Southern turkey buzzard Secession. Not insist upon the national unity! Ah, my friends, this first plank won't do. It is fatally defective—dry-rotted to the very centre!

Put this plank beside the first plank of the Baltimore Platform on which Abraham Lincoln stands firm and square, and mark the contrast!

Resolved, That it is the highest duty of every American citizen to maintain, against all their enemies, the integrity of the Union, and the paramount authority of the Constitution and laws of the United States; and that laying aside all differences of political opinion, *we pledge ourselves as Union men, animated by a common sentiment, and aiming at a common object, to do everything in our power to aid the Government in quelling*, BY FORCE OF ARMS, *the rebellion now raging against its authority*, and in bringing to the punishment due to their crimes the rebels and traitors arrayed against it.

This is like a breath of pure air; it needs no praise. Every patriot feels at the first touch of his knuckle that this plank is sound. He knows that the future of our Government built with such timber will stand the test of war and time.

THE SECOND PLANK OF THE CHICAGO STRUCTURE IS THIS:

Resolved, That this Convention *does explicitly declare*, as the sense of the American people, that, *after four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war*, during which, under the pretense of a military necessity or war power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down, and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired, *justice, humanity, liberty, and the public welfare, demand that* IMMEDIATE EFFORTS BE MADE FOR A CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES, with a view to an ULTIMATE Convention of all the States, or other *peaceable* means, to the end that at the EARLIEST PRACTICABLE MOMENT PEACE MAY BE RESTORED ON THE BASIS OF THE FEDERAL UNION OF THE STATES.

This resolution was written by the hand of Vallandigham himself, and in style and substance it is singularly worthy of its author.

Every patriot feels uneasy about it.

1. Notice, that this *whole* resolution is declared "*explicitly*" to be "*the sense of the American People.*" You may say the three tailors of Tooley street did no harm, and this is innocent enough. Not so. If the American people adopt this platform "as their sense" by electing the candidates placed upon it, it then becomes their will, and must and will control the next Administration. That is the *catch* in these words. Adopt them, and the copperhead sends his fangs into the vitals of the Nation, and it never can recover from his poison.

2. But look further, it says—"*after four years of failure.*" False to begin with! The war has not yet lasted but three years and six months. The rebels began the war by firing on Fort Sumter, April 13, 1861, and President Lincoln called for 75,000 men a few days after. What reason had that Convention to say—as the sense of the American people, that there will be a failure for four years, viz., until April 13, 1865?

The American people believe nothing of the kind. It is their "sense," hope and will, that the war will by that time have ended the Confederacy. The American people will never understandingly resolve, that their armies have failed for four years—certainly not until the four years are up!

3. But has the war failed? Its object was to compel the rebels to submit to the Constitution and laws, and to recover the territory possessed by them.

It was a gigantic undertaking. Our enemies in Europe said at once the task was beyond our strength, and exulted in the fall of the great Republic. But the American people rose to the height of the mighty argument. If they succeed in four years, as I believe they will, it will be the most glorious and successful war history has yet recorded.

Why, when the rebels began the war they held everything south of the Ohio River and the Pennsylvania line, except the City of Washington,—and that city their Secretary of War declared they would take within three months. They held the State of Missouri, running up far north of the Ohio line, and the whole of the vast territory south of the line of Kansas. *Where are they now?* They have lost the States of Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, more than half of Alabama and Georgia, all the Territories, and the last ghost of a chance of ever taking Washington!

When the rebels began the war they had seized and captured, by treachery, every fort and military post along their Atlantic seaboard, except Fortress Monroe; every one on the Gulf of Mexico, and all on the Mississippi River. Our army and navy have taken from them every one of these forts except those that protect Charleston harbor, and every seaport except that and Wilmington. *Does that look like* "FAILURE!"

When they began the war they had 1,063,850 square miles of our territory in their possession; now they have only 345,666. Then they numbered 12,121,314 of inhabitants; now they number only 4,553,241. Then they counted four millions of slaves within their dominions. Our armies have set free, or withdrawn from their control, at least half this number, and have shaken the accursed institution to its very foundation. *Does this look like* "FAILURE?"

They began the war with a million of fighting men—slaves tilling their fields, and allowing all their able-bodied whites to rally around the rebel standard. They had splendid officers, educated at our expense, troops thoroughly drilled in preparation for this rebellion, arms and munitions of war stolen from our arsenals, navy yards treacherously seized from us in which to fit out pirate craft to prey upon our commerce, the aid and comfort of foreign nations, and everything needed to enable and encourage them to wage a long, costly and bloody war. We have destroyed nearly every one of their armies, used up the whole of their available fighting material, exhausted their supplies of arms and of food, captured their guns, destroyed their privateers, seized their fortifications, driven them back upon the Gulf, and brought them at last to the very verge of military annihilation. *Does this look like* "FAILURE?"

4. The convention next try to make the American people declare the war an "EXPERIMENT." Not so at all. The rebels were in arms, and arms were the only means God and Nature had left us wherewith to save our country and government from total destruction, and the constitution prescribed their use. The only other "experiment" was, to have permitted Jefferson Davis to have taken Washington and installed himself there. In other words, to have allowed our constitutionally elected President to be ejected by a Usurper, and to have submitted to an armed despotism for the sake of peace.

5. The convention next say, the "experiment of war" was "to *restore* the Union." Not so. The UNION, meaning the Government of the United States, has never been destroyed; and it is the "sense of the American people" that it never shall be.

But if the Union is a mere compact or league of States, by the secession of one State, its destruction is an accomplished fact—the Union is dead and gone. That is the reason they say "restore." That is the reason copperheads say "war is disunion." You can't coax States back by war, AND THEREFORE IT MUST ALWAYS BE A FAILURE AS A MEANS OF "RESTORING" THE UNION, AND SHOULD BE STOPPED AT ONCE. There is under this Calhoun-theory no power to coerce a State. The Union is at the mercy of their choice to return.

No defeat of the national arms could so thoroughly destroy the national Union as the adoption of this sentiment by our people. Fair words are deceivingly used to obtain this fatal result.

With the same meaning they next arraign the Administration as having "*disregarded the Constitution in every part*" by exercise of the war power. This is a kind of stump speech injected into the belly of this Resolution, and I shall refer to it under the 4th Resolution, where it belongs. Benton says, President Jackson vetoed more than one bill for "*amphibology.*" It is evident enough the so-called Democracy that adopted this Resolution did not take their lesson from old Hickory either in style or patriotism.

6. They next declare as the sense of the American people "that *justice, humanity, liberty and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities," with a view to an ultimate convention of all the States, or*

other PEACEABLE *means*, to the end that at the earliest practicable moment, peace may be restored *on the basis* of the *Federal* union of the *States*."

Mark well, this is the *only* thing in their whole platform that the Convention order their party and candidates TO DO. The rest of their Resolutions contain only sentiment, doctrine, complaints and advice—cheap material and of no practical importance.

If the American people adopt this as their sense by electing the candidates of this convention, they are on the 4th of March next, or soon thereafter, to ask Jefferson Davis for a "cessation of hostilities," which, of course, must be by armistice, or a total abandonment of the war at once.

Mr. Davis may find it convenient to run the blockade by that time, but if he can be found this side of the Rio Grande, he will grant the request at once. Like every wrong-doer he says, he only wants "to be let alone"—a cessation of hostilities is just what he wants. They evidently inconvenience him beyond all measure. Let us follow out the programme.

Time must be taken then to suspend hostilities, to convene Congress, to "*ultimately*" call a Constitutional Convention, to get it ratified by the people of two-thirds of the States, to get delegates elected, to coax Mr. Davis and his friends to attend, which they never will do, unless the doctrine of State sovereignty is conceded to them. And *then*, suppose they should be outvoted! They certainly would be. Would they submit? Not at all. That is what they took up arms about in the first instance, and conceding State sovereignty, we relinquish the right to subdue them. But if we did not, they would then be in fighting trim again on the same question. His confederacy would be recognized by foreign powers and our blockade gone. His cotton would be converted into British gold and ammunition. His recruited army would crush out all unionism in the South. A new crop would be on his hands. His defiance, stimulated by our cowardice, would know no bounds. He would strike out clauses about "national unity" quicker than the Chicago convention. "The best he could do for us" would be, to resolve our national government into a confederacy *under* the State sovereignty, Montgomery version of the Constitution!

You have the traitor now by the throat, and at the last gasp. If you loosen your hand and let him get his wind again, you are conquered!

The whole scheme of coaxing the rebels into a Constitutional Convention, in order to *whip them*, is impracticable. They will never come except to win—failing in that, they have us at their mercy.

7. But if the rebels refuse to come into this Constitutional Convention, or bolt from it, what are we to do? The Convention leaves us in no doubt—we must submit, *surrender!* The cessation of hostilities is to be continued with a view to "other PEACEABLE means." The word "*peaceable*" was used to preclude the idea of *warlike* means being resorted to in any case.

The restriction was purposely made; the *Daily News* of this city shows this, by some revelations of the labors of the committee room in Chicago. It says:

"We especially italicise the word '*peaceable*,' because it is the key to the whole purport and purpose of the resolution, and because it excludes all possible honest belief that the convention meant to countenance further resort to any means, of any sort, which should not be peaceable. Nay more—we assert, as part of the history of the platform, that the resolution, as originally presented, did not contain the word 'peaceable,' which was introduced in committee, upon the special motion of ex-Governor Pratt of Maryland—an uncompromising peace man—and upon the explicit ground, as stated by that gentleman when he proposed it, that in its absence war might possibly be considered as among the 'other means' intended to be suggested. The word 'peaceable' was introduced then to exclude a conclusion in favor of war, in any contingency, and the signification of the whole phrase, as modified and adopted, is so plain to that effect, that no intelligent man in the convention could have understood it in any other sense."

You may say this is true? That they mean by this, to obtain a peace by surrender at discretion to the rebels? The words do mean that and nothing else. The best expounder of the Resolution should be its author, and what does Mr. Vallandigham say of it. Commenting on this second resolution, in a speech at Dayton, shortly after the adjournment of the Chicago Convention, he said:

"It declared as its grand purpose, not to be surrendered, the reconstruction of the Union—the *federal* Union of the States—pointing out the stopping of the war and a convention of the States as the constitutional, lawful, necessary and proper means of accomplishing the work, and it went not beyond. What should be necessary hereafter; what our duty shall be in one, two or three years, Time will be our grand instructor, and he teaches wisely and well. They who are in public life then, filling the high places of responsibility and trust, will discharge their duty, and you will demand of them that which they shall do—always having in view never to surrender that one great object, the reconstruction of the *federal* Union—*not territorial unity*, a unit of despotism—but the *old* federal Union, a union founded on the principles of *federation and compact between sovereign and independent States*, delegating certain powers to their common agent, and withholding from it those not delegated.

* * * * * "But that *great doctrine of State rights is implied in the living words inserted in the last clause of the resolutions relating to peace on the basis of the* FEDERAL *Union, as distinguished from* ANY OTHER *union or any community.*"

These last enlightening remarks of Mr. Vallandigham prove what is meant by the last clause of the resolution—"*that peace may be restored on the basis of the* FEDERAL *Union of the States.*" It is plain, these people have no idea of preserving the National *Government* of the United States. Their "Union" is to be a mere confederation like the one that existed before our present Constitution was adopted. They are, State right, sovereign State, secession men of the Calhoun Jefferson Davis doctrine, that a State can vote itself out of the Union, and the General Government being a mere creature of the States, has no right to coerce it or its people. It can only coax it and them back again. The result of this doctrine is, that the war is unconstitutional and wrong—a wicked usurpation! That was not the doctrine of Washington, Jackson and Webster, and if the American people adopt it "as their sense" the Nation is gone!

This resolution is so worded that the people are made, if they adopt it, to vote the law of the case to be just as Jeff. Davis claims it to be. It fully justifies him and all the rebellion. President Lincoln is a usurper and Gens. Grant and Sherman are trespassers and murderers, if that is the law. Yet this is their chart for the future of our country—all they propose *to do*. It is ignominious surrender, pure and simple. It is *National suicide!*

8. But why should there be a

CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES?

What reasons do they assign for this wonderfully strange course? What requires or *compels* us to abandon our national unity—and break up the Union and Government of our fathers?

1. *Justice*, they say, demands it. Why? Is it *justice* to our fathers, who gave their lives or endured all the horrors of war to gain this goodly heritage for us, that we should basely abandon it to rebels.

Is it *just* to our noble brothers, who have fallen and suffered in this war, that we tell them, "You have bled and suffered for nothing—we commenced the war wrongfully, in a freak of passion; but on reflection we don't think our country worth preserving. 'It is the sense of the American people,' *now*, that they ought to use only "peaceable means," and let the rebels grant us such a country as they choose."

Is it *just* to those now living, that we should let the only great republic of the world fall to pieces? It has fostered and secured our prosperity—it is the protector of us and ours—the land of promise and hope to the poor and oppressed in every part of the world.

Is it *just* to those who will come after us? We live for our children. Through the dim future they call to us not to let their patrimony be lost by our cowardice, not to leave them the legacy of a broken government—a mass of petty, discordant, and belligerent states. No! whether we look to the past, present, or future, *justice forbids* us to abandon this war and claims it as her own.

2. Ah! but say they "*humanity and liberty*" demand it. Is it not evident by immigration, if nothing else, that the people or every land look to our *government* as the home and guardian of humanity and liberty? Every fibre of strength that is taken from our national government weakens the cause of humanity and liberty the world over.

We know well enough that the trouble with these people is, that liberty and humanity are being specially vindicated in this war. As slavery had formerly rooted out true democracy and republicanism at the south, so it stood out as the *Soul* and *Strength* of the rebellion.

SLAVERY.

If fifty years ago the Constitutional right of a free press and free speech had been allowed the Abolitionists and Emancipationists in the Southern States, they would have organized a free society there, and by moral influ-

ences have removed the cause of the rebellion and saved us this desolating war. The Constitution framed to perpetuate *liberty* was shamefully disregarded in order to protect *slavery* from the moral influences of the age. The Abolitionists and Emancipationists were banished to the north, and there sat in "constitutional bonds," uttering Cassandra prophecies from year to year until our fate overtook us. Many of our people had so long worshipped the "black serpent" that they scarcely knew any other God. But the triumph of "liberty, justice and humanity" was nigh. We had refused them when they plead with us from year to year as angels of peace; they came to conquer at last in the terrors of civil war. The army, the people, saw that it was necessary this monster should die, that the nation might live. The President saw that the military necessity of emancipation made it his Constitutional duty—and the deed was done. Since that emancipation proclamation, and by aid of it, our victories have been won.

Now think what these Chicago people mean.

By this war some two millions of poor slaves have struggled into liberty and the hope of enlightenment: and some 200,000 of them are helping to fight our battles in our places. What a beautiful offering to *justice, humanity and liberty* it will be to hand them back to the "tender mercies" of their traitor masters and the "blessings" of slavery? Never fear, the human soul is not mean enough for that!

3. But they insist the "public welfare" demands it; and they say, "the material prosperity of the country is essentially impaired."

This is an appeal to our interest. We are asked to give up our country because it will cost us too much to insist upon its unity.

The answer to this is, we cannot pay more than it is worth as long as we have anything to pay with.

The Strength and Wealth

Of our nation consists of its people and property. Let us see if they are exhausted.

Of course I can only give results here which I, and others, have tested and found to be correct. I confess I had little idea of the immense strength and wealth of our country, until I began to calculate it.

In July, 1864, our public debt was $1,750,000,000, The population of the loyal states 24,900,000. This gives but $72.92 debt to each person, and the interest on the whole of this debt would be at 5½ per cent. $96,000,000, which would give the interest each person has to pay of $3.90. This is too high, for there are $500,000,000 of the public debt on which no interest is paid, it being in the shape of stamps and currency.

This, then, is our debt.

Now what have we to pay with? The value of the real and personal property of the loyal states, July 1, 1864, is correctly estimated at $15,300,000,000. divide this by our population, 24,500,000, and it gives $614.95 to each person; on which the interest at 6 per cent. is $36.86.

It is clear enough we are in a solvent condition yet.

But it is urged the increase of the debt and interest on it, if the war goes on, will overwhelm us.

Let us see which grows the fastest, our debt or our recourses.

From carefully prepared statistics it appears that while the population of the whole United States from 1850 to 1860 increased from 23,191,876 to 31,500,000, or 35.5 per cent. Our property increased from $7,135,780,000 to $16,159,000,000 or 126.45 per cent.

This is the most extraordinary growth ever made by any nation in the world. It is almost startling! Why Great Britain in those ten years increased her population only 1 per cent. and her property only 33 per cent.

Let us assume the war will end by defeat of the rebels in 1865, leaving a debt of $3000,000,000, we will then have the whole country under our government. But we will suppose that the check by the war, or other causes, to the increase of population and property, will reduce the ratio to 30 per cent. on the population, and 100 per cent. on the property for each ten years in the future, though this is too large a reduction by half. Commencing then with 1865 at those rates, we see by the following table how our debt would disappear during this century by the INCREASE of our wealth alone.

COMPARATIVE INCREASE OF WEALTH AND DEBT.

Years.	Population.	National Wealth.	Average Property to each Person.	Average Debt, assumed at $3000,000,000 for each Person.	Annual Interest for each person	Percentage of Debt to Property.
1860	31,500,000	$16,159,000,000	$510.00			
1865	34,000,000	21,574,000,000	634.52	$82.35	$5.35	
1870	40,950,000	32,318,000,000	789.00	73.26	4.38	9.28
1880	53,235,000	64,236,000,000	1214.00	56.35	3.38	4.64
1890	69,205,500	129,272,000,000	1878.00	43.43	2.60	2.32
1900	89,964,150	258,514,000,000	2873.00	33.34	2.00	1.16

The burden of a national debt decreases just in proportion to the increase of national wealth. We have only to look after the interest, and our children can pay the principal without feeling it. The percentage of debt to property tells the story. This is seen in the last column.

This is the reason that Great Britain has so easily carried her national debt. In her case in 1816, after crushing Napoleon, her debt was 37½ per cent. on her property, but in 1858 her debt was only 13.4 per cent. on her property. Of course she was solvent and flourishing. With us the strength to bear grows faster than the burden, even in time of war—immensely faster will it grow, when peace comes with a vindicated government!

This seems like a fairy tale; can it be true?

Think a moment of the natural increase of our population every year, of the immense immigration, which will this year equal to 300,000. Think of the sources of increase of wealth; of agriculture carried over a whole continent by *free labor;* of mining of the precious and useful metals; of coal and petroleum; of labor-saving machinery, of which that of Massachusetts alone equals

100,000,000 of men ; of the public lands ; of commerce, shipping and fisheries, and the almost innumerable branches of industry and profit connected with each of these—think of these, stimulated by an immensely augmented population of free men, and improved upon by the progress of science and art, and who will say that our figures will not be true? They do not lie. This is no dream, but a firmly based and ever-growing reality of strength and grandeur that leaves all past achievements of our race behind as trivial and insignificant. But if we fail now—the national unity—the one condition necessary to the realization of this glorious future will be gone! The discordant States must pursue the arts of war instead of peace. The spring of the national intellect and enterprise will be limited by State lines and restrictions, and dwarfed by defeat. Foreign immigration must fall off when we can no longer protect the asylum it seeks, and when national enterprise ceases to reward industry. Despots will then point to America as to Greece, and say "Her patriotism failed to sustain her NATIONAL UNITY, and in the New World as in the Old, the cradle of liberty became its grave!"

No! Even if we owed all this debt to foreign nations, the "public welfare" requires us to pay it thrice over rather than abandon our national unity or surrender it to armed rebellion. But

TO WHOM DO WE OWE THIS DEBT?

NOT ABROAD, BUT TO OURSELVES! That debt is no burden, because the country is rich enough to pay it, and we get the interest as long as we hold it—*the debt is really individual property.* Throughout the country we have paid off our individual debts and taken the debt of the government to us. We have very generally ceased to be debtors and have become creditors of our government. If the government is sustained and vindicated, this credit is wealth. But if the government is abandoned, it is repudiation and dead loss! Does public welfare require us to make this sacrifice in order to lose our country?

Again Mr. Davis will certainly submit to no "*peaceable* means" of restoring peace that does not pay the rebel home and foreign debt, in case ours is paid. There is no mistake about this. Even his friends at the north, when they speak of compromise always include the payment or consolidation of the debt of both parties. We are to lose our cause,—our country, and pay the costs of both parties, in order to "secure the public welfare." Would it not be infinitely cheaper then, to continue the war till our debt was doubled before surrender?

Yes. Our country is still rich in men and means, and is growing richer almost beyond calculation. Courage, confidence, and unity of sentiment in using the immense resources we have, is all we need. Some people talk as though we had our last man in the field,—our last dollar in the treasury. Not so. We have not yet put forth half our strength. And what we are to purchase by this outlay is beyond any calculable price. Take the loans of your government then, freely. She will pay. When final victory touches her banners—

every one of her notes will command a premium over gold. Patriotism is a safe bank. Next to your God you may trust your Country with all you have.

Thank God and take courage! We can never purchase "public welfare" nor "material prosperity" by selling our country.

Now—look at the counterparts of this second Resolution as they stand in the Baltimore Platform.

Resolved, That we approve the determination of the Government of the United States, *not to compromise with rebels*, nor to offer any terms of peace except such as may be based upon an unconditional surrender of their hostility, and a return to their just allegiance to the Constitution and laws of the United States, and that we call upon the Government to maintain this position and to *prosecute the war with the utmost possible vigor* to the complete suppression of the rebellion, in full reliance upon the self-sacrifice, the patriotism, the heroic valor, and the undying devotion of the American people to their country and its free institutions.

Resolved, That the national faith, pledged for the redemption of the public debt, must be keep inviolate; and that for this purpose we recommend economy and rigid responsibility in the public expenditures, and a vigorous and just system of taxation, and that it is the duty of every loyal State to sustain the credit and promote the use of the national currency.

These ARE the "sense of the American people;" they mean peace and the Union by victory, not peace and *some* Union by surrender.

THE THIRD CHICAGO PLANK IS THIS:

Resolved, That the direct interference of the military authorities of the United States in the recent elections held in Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri and Delaware was a shameful violation of the Constitution, and the repetition of such acts in the approaching election will be held as revolutionary, and *resisted with all means and power under our control.*

The interference complained of was guarding the polls, so that they could not be broken up by armed rebels, and in administering the oath of allegiance, so that rebels might not outvote loyal men.

This was all that was done. If it had not been done Jeff Davis would have carried every one of those states by marching his soldiers up to the ballot boxes. *That would have been far more easy and effective for him than fighting!*

The purity of the ballot box, the very first *democratic* principle, required that armed rebels should be kept away by "direct military interference," and traitors by the oath of allegiance. What Jackson Democrat would object to that, or would fail to charge it as the highest crime on the Administration, if it neglected this duty? But these Calhoun men—democrats so-called—think it a plain violation of state rights and the constitution. Of course if the constitution is, as they believe it, merely a compact of confederation, the exercise of military power to maintain the "national unity" is a criminal usurpation. But the most singular part of this resolution is the last clause. Such interference, they say, "*will be resisted with all means and power in our control.*" In the proceedings of this convention we find the following:

Mr. Wickliff, of Kentucky, then rose and said that the delegates from the West were of the opinion that circumstances may occur between now and the 4th of March next for the Democracy of the country to meet in convention again. He therefore moved the following resolution, which was *unanimously* adopted.

Resolved, That this Convention shall not be *dissolved by adjournment at the close of its business, but shall remain organized* subject to be called at *any time* and *place that the Executive National Committee shall designate.*

This was unusual. No political convention had ever taken a like step before in our country. It meant *something.* But what? Honest democrats in this part of the country were at a loss to know—too, what *means and power* the Convention had in their control to resist the General Government.

We know *now* what the copperheads of the West were driving at. They meant to open the polls to the rebels by force, and to organize a conspiracy that would plunge the West and North into a revolution.

The Sons of Liberty, of which Dodd was one of the leaders, then numbered its tens of thousands. Dodd was arrested. His trial at Indianapolis proved him guilty, and proved the fearful nature and extent of this conspiracy. Dodd pretended boldness and innocence at first, but when he saw that his guilt was proved, he escaped from jail, was hurried into Canada by his confederates. But the loyal Democracy, the Jackson Democracy of Indiana, saw their danger, and at their State Election on the 11th of October, crushed the conspirators beneath a union majority perfectly overwhelming.

Think of this third plank and Wickliff's resolution being adopted *unanimously*, and be *forewarned!* It is much easier to defeat these conspirators *by ballot than it will be by bullets.* They must be taught by such majorities as were given against them in Ohio and Indiana, how little they understand the "sense of the American People," and the Jackson Democracy of the North!

I earnestly request every man to read the able and beautiful Report of Judge Joseph Holt, dated October 8, 1864, on the evidence obtained at the trials of these conspirators. This secret conspiracy under the name of Sons of Liberty, Knights of the Circle, &c., had its thousands of armed men aiding the rebels in Missouri, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and in a modified form under the name of "McClellan Minute Men," in New York. The *Rituals of these secret orders are based upon the very same Calhoun phrases that occur in the Chicago Platform, and were apparently written by the same hand—certainly with the same meaning.* They had actually commenced the inauguration of *Civil War.* "*Direct military interference*" *is all that saved the West from its horrors.*

Let no Jackson Democrat suppose that because he is honest and patriotic that the present leaders of the so-called democratic party are so too. The *children of Jackson and Calhoun are not of the same family!*

THE FOURTH CHICAGO PLANK IS THIS:

Resolved, That the aim and object of the Democratic party is to preserve *the Federal Union* and *the rights of the States* unimpaired; and they hereby declare that they consider the Administrative *usurpation of extraordinary and dangerous powers not granted by the Constitution*, the subversion of the civil by military law in States not in insurrection, the arbitrary military arrest, imprisonment, trial and sentence of American citizens in States where civil law exists in full force, the suppression of freedom of speech and of the press, the denial of the right of asylum, THE OPEN AND AVOWED DISREGARD OF STATE RIGHTS, the employment of unusual test-oaths, AND THE INTERFERENCE WITH AND DENIAL OF THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE TO BEAR ARMS, AS CALCULATED TO PREVENT A RESTORATION OF THE UNION, AND A PERPETUATION OF A GOVERNMENT DERIVING ITS JUST POWERS FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED.

This Fourth Resolution opens with the "*Federal* Union" and the "Rights of the States." The idea that there is any such power as a National Government is entirely omitted from every part of their platform—they always qualify the word "Union" so that it shall not be taken for a National Government, but simply a union of States. The further we go, the clearer it is, that the SPIRIT of Calhoun wrote this Platform by the HAND of Vallandigham.

CHARGES AGAINST THE ADMINISTRATION.

I cannot tax your patience to answer all the charges against the Administration set forth in this Resolution. They all rest on the same false basis. They are instances of the exercise of war powers. If by the Constitution the President is vested with such powers in order to defend and protect the Constitution and the National Government embodied in that charter, THEN THEY ARE NOT USURPATIONS, NOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL, NOR ILLEGAL, BUT THE CONTRARY. The Democracy of Jackson said, and still say, THE NATION MUST LIVE! The Calhoun Democracy said, and say by this platform, "THE FEDERAL UNION" *may* live, as long as the States can be coaxed to agree to support it, but the President cannot "coerce" a State, nor individuals acting under State authority. THAT IS THE ISSUE OF LIFE OR DEATH TO THE NATION. The decision of the people on this question settles its fate just as certainly as defeat or victory in the field.

I wish I had time to expose the injustice, exaggeration and falsehood of each of these charges, but I can only refer to

MILITARY ARRESTS.

This is the greatest rebellion since the angels were thrust from Heaven, yet the President HAS NOT HUNG ONE TRAITOR. All the military arrests made in his name don't exceed 500, and most of these have been set free on taking the oath of allegiance, and in hard cases, giving security not to take up arms with, or aid the rebels. The writ of *habeas corpus* has been long ago legally suspended, yet we hardly know it. Such leniency we would hardly expect even in an ordinary insurrection or street fight in any other country. All the acts charged ARE ACTS OF WAR. In war, arrests are not made for the purpose of punishing the offender for a crime—not for trial under civil laws—but for the

purpose of preventing the man from harming the government by aiding the enemy. It is like an injunction or preliminary arrest—a civil suit to prevent injury from being done, not to punish it. In that noble and beautiful letter of the President to Erastus Corning, of Albany, on the Arrest of Vallandigham, the whole matter is clearly and truly stated. I earnestly beseech all who have doubts on this subject to read that letter. The case of Vallandigham come up before Judge Leavett, a democratic Judge appointed by President Jackson. In deciding that case he thus stated the law.

"In time of war the President is not above the Constitution, but derives his power expressly from the provision of that Instrument, declaring that he shall be Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. The Constitution does not specify the powers he may rightfully exercise in this character. No one denies, however, that the President, in this character, is invested with very high powers." . . . . . .

"And in deciding what he may rightfully do under this power, where there is no express legislative declaration, the President is guided solely by his own judgment and discretion, and is only amenable for an abuse of his authority by impeachment prosecuted according to the requirements of the Constitution."

The power does exist to defend the Constitution from traitors and conspirators. When necessity calls, the duty must be exercised. The President has used this power rarely, and with remarkable clemency. It will be the fault of such conspirators as Dodd, and Vallandigham, and Wickliffe, acting under the inspiration of the Chicago Platform, if it is ever exercised again. The President is mild but firm. He has undertaken to maintain the National Unity, and as long as he is President he will do it—the Chicago Convention the Calhoun Democracy, and the Sons of Liberty to the contrary, notwithstanding! He relies upon the true "sense," the common sense of the American people for support.

The last clause complains that all these acts of war are "calculated to prevent a RESTORATION of the Union, and the PERPETUATION OF GOVERNMENT DERIVING ITS JUST POWERS FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED.

Here we have the same story, the Union to be *restored*; thus admitting it is dissolved—"perpetuation of government," but not *the* government of the United States, but *some* government or other "deriving its just powers," not from the constitution as it now stands, but from the consent of the "governed."

But who are the "governed," whose consent is necessary?

In the Declaration of Independence, the sentence of which this is meant to be the echo, refers to a majority of the people. Here it means the Rebel States "whose consent is necessary to restore the "FEDERAL UNION," and whose "consent," must be obtained by coaxing and surrender, not by exercise of war powers. The same words occur in the Ritual of the Sons of Liberty, with this meaning. No one can fully understand the Chicago Platform without reading that Ritual and seeing how these very phrases are there made the basis for conspiracy, revolution and murder.

THE FIFTH AND SIXTH CHICAGO PLANKS

are too light timber to stand any examination. We place them before the corresponding Baltimore planks to show their hollowness and mockery.

CHICAGO.

Resolved, That the shameful disregard *of the Administration* to its duty in respect to our fellow-citizens who now and long have been *prisoners of war* in a suffering condition, deserves the severest reprobation, on the score alike of public interest and common humanity.

Resolved, That the *sympathy* of the Democratic party is heartily and earnestly extended to the soldiery of our army, who are and have been in the field under the flag of our country; and, *in the event of our obtaining power*, they will receive all the *care and protection, regard and kindness*, that the brave soldiers of the Republic have so nobly earned.

BALTIMORE.

Resolved, That the Government owes to all men employed in its armies, without regard to distinction of color, the full protection of the laws of war, and that any violation of the laws or of the usages of civilized nations in the time of war by the rebels now in arms, should be made the subject of full and prompt redress.

Resolved, That the *thanks* of the American people are due to the soldiers and sailors of the army and navy, who have periled their lives in defense of their country, and in vindication of the honor of its flag; that the nation owes to them *some permanent recognition of their patriotism and valor, and ample and permanent provision* for those of their survivors who have received disabling and honorable wounds in the service of the country; and that the memories of those who have fallen in its defense shall be held in grateful and everlasting remembrance.

Let us sift the meaning out of

McCLELLAN'S LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE.

It is well for the Committee of the Convention that the Candidate to whom they presented this Chicago Platform was not General Jackson, or a General upon whom his mantle had fallen. How sublime would have been the storm of indignation with which he would have hurled it back upon them? Alas! it was presented to a General in every respect the exact opposite to the Hero of New Orleans. For nine days he was silent. In those days Atlanta fell, and Grant moved upon the Weldon Road. It became evident that this platform would not stand even the storm of an election, unless it was touched up with war paint. It might do pure and simple for the western Conspirators and Butternuts, but not for the more honest Democrats of the Atlantic slope. There was

a hurrying to and fro of Committee men. The letter of acceptance must accept the peace platform, and it must make it palatable to war democracy. How was that possible? They tell me that in hard times in Mexican mountains when the mules refuse to eat their provender of dry leaves, it is found sufficient to but a pair of green goggles over their eyes, whereupon the innocent animals, thinking the greenness is in their fodder, instead of themselves, devour it readily. This letter is a mere blind. If possible, it is even more dangerous than the avowed surrender it is to make palatable.

It is evident that neither McClellan nor any ONE man wrote it as it now stands. It has been terribly doctored by peace and war men alternately, until its dislocated non-committal paragraphs got so weak that neither party could tell who would be cheated by them, and then it was sent to the public.

1. He says "the nomination comes unsought."

Unless he, together with his personal friends have been seeking this nomination ever since he was at the head of the army, his and their conduct belongs to the unaccountable singularities of human conduct.

2. He next is "happy that the convention kept in view the record of his public life."

His record is so short that the convention had little difficulty in so doing. He never held a civil office in his life.

3. He next says, that service in the army in war and peace had made the love and reverence for the union, constitution, laws and flag of our country impressed upon him in early youth "indelible."

His education in early youth, and in the army in peace and war, was of the pro-slavery, state right, aristocratic kind, prevalent at West Point and under the Pierce and Jeff Davis Administration. No! love and reverence won't do, now! We want acts, facts, and principles that can't be misunderstood. When Jeff Davis visited Portland in 1860, he exceeded all I ever heard in expressions of "love and reverence," &c., for the Union.

4. He says these feelings have guided the course of his life, and must continue to do so to its end.

Do these feelings *now* guide him to *preserve* the *National* Union by continuing the war and subduing the rebels by arms, or to *restore* the *Federal* Union "by cessation of hostilities?" We shall see in a moment.

5. His next idea, is that "the existence of more than one government over the region which once owned our flag is incompatable with the peace, the power, and the happiness of the people."

Must that "*one* government" be our present government vindicated by arms, or a new one "deriving its just powers" from the consent of the Rebel States? We shall learn soon from this letter.

6 and 7. The next *two* paragraphs (for I must hurry on) are luminous with

theory of the war. It was "commenced," he says, "with the sole avowed object to preserve the Union. It should have been conducted for that object, [just as though it had *not* been] and in accordance with the principles which he took occasion to declare while in active service." That is, in his letter to the President from Harrison Landing, where his defeated army lay under the protection of our gunboats.

"Thus conducted," he says, "THE WORK OF RECONCILIATION WOULD HAVE BEEN EASY, and we might have reaped the benefits of our many victories on land and sea."

If the phrase "*thus conducted*" refers to carrying on the war to preserve the Union, it has been so done. But if it had been carried on according to the notions in the Harrison Landing letter, we never should have had any victories to reap the benefit of. This we know, for, it was by rejecting those notions and their author, and by using all the means we could, that we gained those victories. But the luminous idea and singular confession is, that if we had BEATEN THEM ONLY A LITTLE, AS HE DID, they might have been reconciled. Thus it appears that he was all the while a political General, using his arms for the purpose of making a "reconciliation easy," instead of subduing the rebel armies by decisive victory, and vindicating the laws. This confession should never be forgotten.

8. He next says, that because the Union was formed by conciliation and compromise it must be restored by the same means.

Not so. We may compromise to make a bargain or a government, but after it is made all parties must be held to it. It is the end of all popular government, if it must be the subject of a new compromise every time the defeated minority choose to rebel. No doctrine more dangerous than this was ever announced to the American people. In ten years it would render our government no better than that of New Mexico and the South American republics.

9. The next paragraph looks at first as though the war people were getting the upper hand, but the contrary is the fact. "The *re-establishment* of the Union in all its integrity is, and must continue to be, the indispensable condition in any *settlement*."

We are then to have a *settlement* or compromise with the rebels for the purpose of *re-establishing* the Union, which must in that case be a "federal Union." For he goes on to say, that as soon as "our present adversaries are ready for peace on the basis of the Union, we should exhaust all the resources of statesmanship practised by civilized nations, and taught by the traditions of the American people, consistent with honor and interests of the country *to secure such peace, re-establish the Union and guarantee for the future the constitutional rights of every State.*"

Mark, he says "as soon as the rebels are ready for peace" we should go on and make all these frantic exertions by compromise to secure it. If they are

"*ready,*" it seems to me we could except their submission to the laws without any such "exhaustion of statesmanship and traditions," &c. This language seems mere twaddle, but it is not. It is meant to prepare and suborn our patriotism to accept the conclusion "guarantee for the future the constitutional rights of every State," that is, accept a "federal Union" and a confederate peace. For what does a man, educated under Jefferson Davis and the disciples of Calhoun, mean by such phrases as "guaranteeing the rights of every State." Alas! we know too well! He concludes, "The Union is the one condition of peace—we ask no more." If it is a confederate Union, to be made by the rebel States, upon the ruins of the national government—we do ask more.

10. That I am giving no forced construction to this language, the next paragraph shows clearly.

He says: "Let me add, what I doubt not was, although unexpressed, the sentiment of the convention, as it is of the people they represent, that when *any one State* is willing to return to the Union, it should be *received at once, with a full guarantee of all its constitutional rights.*"

That is, the States are to return to the Union *as States* with full guarantee to each State of "its constitutional rights." The people are wholly left out of the account. The government is not to be preserved as a national government of the people. But the Union is to be a reconstructed federal league of States. And the resources of STATESMANSHIP, &c., not WAR—are to be "*exhausted*" (think of that terrible word) to make the best bargain we can with them, on claiming admission to this new confederacy.

This is the exact view of Alexander H. Stephens, the rebel vice-president. Let those, who would understand this letter, read *his* letter of September 22, 1864. He goes into poetic ecstasies over the State sovereignty doctrine of the Chicago platform.

The next paragraph says:

11. "If a frank, earnest and *persistent* effort to obtain *those objects* should fail, the responsibility for "*ulterior consequences*" will fall upon those who remain in arms against the Union."

Such "effort" would not fail, unless Mr. Davis should be too blind to know when his enemies surrender to him, in that case the responsibility, and blunder would be certainly with him and his friends.

YOU SEE THIS LETTER ADOPTS AND PROCEEDS UPON THE PROGRAMME OF THE CHICAGO PLATFORM—FIRST, WE ARE TO STOP HOSTILITIES and exhaust "statesmanship and the traditions of the country" in making compromises, and if THEN the rebels won't accept the "federal Union," or, in other words, won't admit us into their confederacy, he talks of "ULTERIOR consequences." He says the "ulterior consequences will fall upon those who remain in

arms against the Union." What consequences? Why the consequences of having a divided country, which he thinks "incompatible with the interests of the people." For, as I have shown, if we let up the rebels, as he here proposes, for the purpose of FIRST compromising with them in convention, if we there fail to get low enough to suit them—they, "who REMAIN in arms against the Union," WILL HAVE THEIR CONFEDERACY ACKNOWLEDGED AND INVINCIBLY ESTABLISHED AND US AT THEIR MERCY.

It is in this connection, and AFTER compromising, that he says, "But the *Union* must be preserved at all *hazards*." What Union—what *hazards* should we have the choice of *then*? There can be but one answer. Such a Union as Mr. Davis and the rebel States might choose to preserve after throwing away our national government, and *that* we must take at the hazard of seeing that our "exhausted statesmanship" had established a seperate southern confederacy! When President Jackson, in fighting Calhoun and these same State-right doctrines, said, the "Union must, and shall be preserved!" we knew he meant the national government, of which he was the head, and that he was not going to leave it stripped of its power, at the mercy of armed rebels, for some two years, to see if he could not THEN rescue it from their grasp by exhausting the resources of "statesmanship and traditions." The candidate cannot now be trusted who is bound by his party and binds himself to preserve the Union by exchanging the hazards of successful war for the hazards of such a compromise with rebels.

12. His respects are next paid to his comrades of the army and navy. He says he "could not look in their face and tell them their sacrifices had been in vain." He need not do it; for, has he not just told us that he and HIS comrades conducted the war not to hurt the enemy, but to make "reconciliation easy" for them. He need not tell them that "THAT UNION," for which WE have so often perilled our lives, is abandoned." Certainly not, until the resources of his statesmanship are exhausted without effect.

13. He next concludes that he and a vast majority of our people in the army and navy or at home would hail, with unbounded joy, the permanent restoration of peace, on the basis of the "UNION UNDER THE CONSTITUTION." We know what school this phrase belongs to. It is the Calhoun dialect, and means a Union as a confederacy of States—a "federal Union" as distinguished from the National Union and Government, of which Jackson was and Lincoln is President. That I do not mistake his meaning, the next line shows: "But no peace can be permanent without UNION." What kind of Union? The Chicago convention could not say THE government. Why this shying at the definite article THE? Because he expects to take SUCH a Union as the rebels will grant peace upon when his statesmanship is exhausted.

14. The next clause might be innocent enough, if we did not know that some of the party phrases seemingly fair describe limitations of the war

power in favor of the rebels. He promises "to seek in the Constitution" for "limitations of executive power," not for power to put down the rebellion; he is to "restore economy" and re-establish the law." The "cessation of hostilities" would doubtless stop the expenses of the war for a time, and do away with the suspension of the HABEAS CORPUS. He next promises "THE OPERATION of a more vigorous nationality." How this vigorous nationality is to "OPERATE" we are not told, but by it, we are to resume our COMMANDING POSITION among the nations of the earth. This, if it means anything but twaddle, seems to indicate that after we compromise with Mr. Davis, we are to unite with him in a foreign war. May it not be a basis of this projected compromise that we should conquer enough of Mexico or Cuba and Central America, to enable the number of slave States to equal the free States. This equality was the pet theory of Calhoun and his aristocracy. In fact, they did not rebel as long as they were able to keep up that equality.

15. The next clause is, "The condition of our finances, the depreciation of our paper money, and the burdens thereby imposed on labor and capital, show the necessity of a return to a sound financial system."

This means that our present financial system is unsound, and that we must return to the one we had, before our paper money depreciated. If this means anything, it means REPUDIATION! If not, why does he not intimate some system to which he proposes to return. He conjures up "burdens" (which I have shown to be imaginary) "imposed on labor and capital" by our present system, thus aiding the rebels by breaking it down, and promises them, that if he is elected, he will return to the one before the war. He cannot do so without giving up the war. No country ever carried on a war without making its credit money. To try to "return" to what was or might have been a sound system before the war made the issue of paper currency necessary, is not only "cessation of hostilities"—it is, REPUDIATION and RUIN.

But he goes on to say, "While the rights of citizens and the rights of states, and the binding authority of law over President, army and people, are subjects of not less vital importance in war than peace."

I have shown before that, by the constitution, the civil law is silent in time of war, to the extent that the President is obliged to use war powers to put down the resistance to the Constitution, the laws and the government thereof. If by "law" he means military law, the laws of war he asserts a stale flat truism; but if he means by "law" that the "civil law" is "binding" "authority over President, army and people" in war, he says what is ridiculous. According to that Grant has no right to execute a rebel spy until he has been indicted by a grand jury, tried by a United States judge, and sentenced. But that he does so mean is evident, because he describes the "law" he refers to as "just as vitally important in war as in PEACE." As military law is not binding on the people in time of peace, it must therefore be the civil law he is talking about. Thus the PRESIDENT, ARMY AND PEOPLE are bound by the

civil law in time of civil war! And he says the "rights of citizens and rights of states" are just as important, that is, are to be respected the same "in war as in peace." A war according to civil law, respecting the rights of rebel citizens and rebel states just as though we were at peace with them, is an utter impossibility. In every way this paragraph is viewed, it is absurd and ridiculous.

16. He next says: "BELIEVING THAT THE VIEWS HERE EXPRESSED ARE THOSE OF THE CONVENTION AND THE PEOPLE YOU REPRESENT, I ACCEPT THE NOMINATION."

When he wrote this, he had the Chicago platform lying before him, for he refers to it in the 14th paragraph—it expressed the UNANIMOUS views of the convention, and he knew it. He says that he believes the views he has expressed in this letter are the same, and I fully agree with him. He confirms all I have said—he hereby puts substantially the same construction on his phrases that I do—he says, they "are those of the convention" the same identical ones in meaning. Such a "Christian gentleman" would never have accepted the nomination of this convention if his views had differed from theirs.

Why then was it necessary to send to the world such a mass of dubious incoherent platitudes? Why raise such a fog if there was nothing to hide? The reason is, that after the fall of Atlanta green goggles were necessary to make northern democrats take copperheadism, Calhoun semi-treason, and base surrender in the place of Jackson democracy. Many were thus a little blinded at first, but if they chew the cud a little, they will soon find out the mistake.

17. He says, "I realize the weight of the responsibility to be borne should the people ratify their choice."

If the weak man who would put, or permit his name to be put, to such a letter as this, although backed by Wood and Vallandigham and Pendleton, ever undertakes to "exhaust resources of statesmanship" with Jefferson Davis, in whose hands poor Pierce was like clay in the hands of a potter, the sharp incisive intellect, the clear stern will, the reckless daring of the American Cataline will soon leave him no choice but surrender. In such a defeat, he would not have even a gunboat for a refuge. He says he is "conscious of his own weakness." Then we had better not let him loosen the rebel giant to see if HE can't throw him on the field of compromise.

18. He next talks of fervently seeking the guidance of the Ruler of the Universe and relying on His all powerful aid." I have observed that the Almighty aids those men and nations who call upon Him not by words alone but by acts. Who in time of war instead of longing for a surrender, keep their courage up and their powder dry; but that a nation like a woman, who hesitates when her honor is in question is lost.

He is, however, moderate in his demands upon the Divine Power. He is to do his best to "RESTORE UNION [not THE Union] and peace to a SUFFERING people,

[including those great sufferers, the rebels,] and to establish and guard THEIR rights and liberties."

The rights and liberties of the loyal people of the United States are not yet lost, nor likely to be. The Rebels at the South and their fellow Conspirators at the north, if they get their "rights" will be deprived of their "liberty" to destroy our National Government, and continue so to be, until they submit to its Constitution and laws like the rest of us.

This is the end of the letter.

The Peace Copperheads, the Woods, Vallandighams, Voorhies, Longs, and McMasters, pretended to be put out by it, but on consultation, saw it was all right for them, and turned right in and supported McClellan heartily. The DAILY NEWS says it was a blind, that the Chicago Platform had been substantially presented to McClellan before the Convention met and been approved by him—and its statement has never been denied. Wood knew, as McClellan says, that it was, when examined, the same thing as the Chicago Platform; but what if it is not? Says he in a speech in New York, "If elected I am satisfied he will entertain the views and execute the principles of the great party he will represent WITHOUT REGARD TO THOSE HE MAY HIMSELF POSSESS. HE WILL THEN BE OUR AGENT, THE CREATURE OF OUR VOICE."

And he is right. Pendleton, who must be voted for by the same electors as McClellan, was on the floor of the Convention and gave his hearty consent to the Chicago Platform, and afterwards glorified it in a short speech from the steps of Vallandigham House, at Dayton, Ohio, as those "BENEFICIENT PRINCIPLES RECENTLY SOLEMNLY ANNOUNCED IN NATIONAL CONVENTION." On the same occasion Vallandigham made a few remarks—referred to Pendleton "as his own familiar friend," and said:

"The Chicago Platform enunciated its [the Democratic party's] policy and principles by authority, and was binding upon every democrat, and by them the democratic administration MUST and SHOULD BE GOVERNED."

These speeches werepublished in the Dayton EMPIRE just after the publication of McClellan's letter.

There is no mistaking the voice of this platform as expounded by its candidates, authors and principal supporters. If adopted, it is the end of our country as a Nation.

I have chosen to consider Gen. McClellan, like Pendleton, to be honest, and also intelligent enough to know the meaning of his platform and letter. Some of his friends, however, seem to intimate that he does not understand them thoroughly, or does not intend to be bound by them.

If he does not understand his own chart, certainly he ought not to be put at the helm. If he intends to deceive and mislead a large part of his employers and crew as to his course, the ship of state, will certainly be subjected to new divisions, mutinies and disasters in his hands.

Abraham Lincoln is sound, honest and experienced. He has brought us within sight of the peace we hope to gain. Certainly it is not safe to change him for a green and uncertain hand until this voyage is over.

Now for

PENDLETON'S HASKIN LETTER.

What Atlanta did for McClellan, the Union majority of 75,000 in Ohio did for Pendleton. It made the dumb speak! When the Copperheads begin to cry Union, they know their end is near. As the last hope, Pendleton writes a private letter to John B. Haskin, dated October 17, 1864. He complains in a line or so about "falsehoods," &c., and then says:

"I MAKE NO PROFESSIONS OF A NEW FAITH—ONLY REPEAT MY REITERATED PROFESSIONS OF AN OLD ONE, when I say that there is no one who cherishes a greater regard for the Union—who has a higher sense of its inestimable benefits—WHO WOULD MORE EARNESTLY LABOR FOR ITS RESTORATION BY ALL MEANS WHICH WILL EFFECT THAT END, than myself. The Union is the guaranty of the peace, the power, the prosperity of this people; and no man would deprecate more heartily, or oppose more persistently the establishment of another government over any portion of the territory ever within its limits."

All talk about "cherishing regard for the Union"—"sense of its benefits"—its being the "guaranty of peace" &c., "deprecating" or "opposing the establishment of another government," &c., &c., amounts to just the same thing as the "adhering" and "unswerving fidelity" of the first plank of the Chicago platform and no more.

The people are sick of empty professions. They want to know what their candidates WILL DO. They must have WORKS, or at least the honest PROMISE of them. He says he professes his old faith. His record shows what that is—and that he is an EXTREME CALHOUNITE opposed to the war in word, act and vote.

Thus, in Congress, January 18, 1861, he said: "To-day, sir, four States of the Union have, as far as their power extends, seceded from it. Four States, as far as they are able, HAVE ANNULLED THE GRANTS OF POWER MADE TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT; THEY HAVE RESUMED THE POWERS DELEGATED BY THE CONSTITUTION; they have cancelled, as far as they could, EVERY LIMITATION UPON THE FULL EXERCISE OF ALL THEIR SOVEREIGN RIGHTS, they do not claim our protection; they seek none of the advantages of the CONFEDERATION. On

the other hand, they renounce their allegiance ; they repudiate our authority over them, and they assert that they have assumed, SOME OF THEM THAT THEY HAVE RESUMED THEIR POSITION AMONG THE FAMILY OF SOVEREIGNTIES AMONG THE NATIONS.

"Sir, I deal in no harsh epithets ; I will denounce no State, no body of men. I will not pause to enquire whether they have done all this legally or wisely or upon sufficient cause. THEY HAVE DONE IT, AND I RECOGNIZE THE FACT." In conclusion, he says: "SIR, THE WHOLE SCHEME OF COERCION IS IMPRACTICABLE. IT IS CONTRARY TO THE GENIUS AND SPIRIT OF THE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. Pendleton says further, "My voice to-day is for conciliation ; my voice is for compromise. I beg you, gentlemen, to hear that voice. If you will not, if you find conciliation impossible, if your differences are so great that you cannot or will not reconcile them; THEN, GENTLEMEN, LET THE SECEDING STATES DEPART IN PEACE, LET THEM ESTABLISH THEIR GOVERNMENT AND EMPIRE, AND WORK OUT THEIR DESTINY ACCORDING TO THE WISDOM WHICH GOD HAS GIVEN THEM."

As late as January, 1863, he advocated, in Congress, Vallandigham's resolutions to amend the Constitution, by breaking up the Union into four sections. A most infamous proposal. I have no space to give his record. He voted against all war measures or dodged them. Not a man nor dollar has he voted to put down the rebellion. His record has been published, showing his hostility to the National Government. He has been brought to New York to cry "Union," and in so doing he says that his published record is a forgery, and his only proof is, that one of his votes is put down for July 7, 1864, And Congress, he says, adjourned on the 4th of July, 1864. It should be January 7, 1864. This misprint of July for January is all he can find to object to. What difference does it make whether he voted against the Union in January or July? He does not deny the fact! Read that record and be sure the more such a man cries "Union," the more anxious he is to surrender the Union to rebels. He is for a UNION on DISUNION principles.

In the Haskin Letter he promises "to labor for the restoration of the Union BY ALL MEANS THAT WILL EFFECT THAT END!!

Here is the cloven foot in plain sight. He means by this COMPROMISE, SUBMISSION, not WAR! He tells us "the whole scheme OF COERCION IS IMPRACTICABLE." It is "CONTRARY TO THE GENIUS AND SPIRIT OF THE Constitution." And his constant voting in the house against raising money, men and means for the war shows that he is honest in his belief that the war is "impracticable" and against the Constitution.

"War is disunion," according to his Calhoun theory, pure and simple.

He is then to labor for "the restoration of the Union," according to his old faith, he has no new one he is careful to tell us.

What does that mean? Simply that he is to join McClellan in "EXHAUSTING THE RESOURCES OF STATESMANSHIP," INSTEAD OF GOING ON WITH THE WAR.

Instead of saying, that it elected, he will go on with the war, or favor that course—as he could do in one line—he refers to his damning record, and uses the deceitful phrase that he and all his Calhoun friends use to describe the "cessation of hostilities," and submission in a national convention, with a Southern Confederacy as the only alternative from our necessity if not choice.

That he might THERE "persistently oppose a Southern Confederacy—MAY BE But after your head is in the lion's mouth, the more "persistently" you oppose his taking it off, the more certainly he will do it.

The last clause of his letter makes this meaning clearer. He says:

"I am in favor OF EXACTING NO CONDITIONS, INSISTING UPON NO TERMS NOT PRESCRIBED IN THE CONSTITUTION; and I am opposed to any course of policy which will defeat the RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT upon its OLD FOUNDATIONS, and in its territorial integrity. I am, very truly, yours, &c."

He "is in favor of exacting no conditions, insisting upon no terms not prescribed in the constitution!!"

Here he is plainly talking about the terms of the compromise which must be as the Chicago Platform prescribes in National Convention.

The CONSTITUTION can PRESCRIBE no terms nor conditions to a CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION. Such conventions are called for the very purpose of ALTERING the Constitution and doing away with it. The rebels would only come into it for that purpose, and for the purpose of abrogating or changing the National Government. Again, according to his Calhoun theory, if the Constitution can't keep states from SECEDING, and we recognize that fact, by asking them into a convention—how can it limit sovereign states with "terms" or "conditions?" The idea is ridiculous. The phrase "NOT PRESCRIBED IN THE CONSTITUTION" means just nothing, except AS A BLIND. When he says he "is in favor of exacting no conditions, insisting upon no terms," he MEANS UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER TO THE REBELS, through the forms of a convention. That is all of it. The rebels will enter a convention for the very purpose of doing away with our present constitution and government. THEIR ARMS not OUR CONSTITUTION WILL DICTATE what TERMS WE SHALL GIVE THEM—or rather THEY US!

He is "opposed to any course of policy which will defeat the RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT ON ITS OLD FOUNDATIONS, and its territorial integrity."

What does he mean by RE-ESTABLISHING THE GOVERNMENT ON OLD FOUNDATIONS?

You see the government is to be established AGAIN! I supposed it was already ESTABLISHED, and that the only question was whether it SHOULD STAND OR NOT.

His "own familiar friend," Vallandigham, would mean by "old foundations," the old Articles of Confederation, and it is not clear but that he does, too. If not that, he certainly means that he is opposed to everything that will prevent a "RESTORATION of the Union" upon the Sovereign State construction of the Constitution, with the Southern Aristocrats in full control of what National Government they choose to leave us. It is by such concessions that he promises us the mockery of "TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY." If he spoke truly he would rather say the Extension of the Southern Confederacy over the North! That is what it amounts to!

Thus ends his letter. It is just as expressive as his silence, but not as honest.

If he differs in meaning from the Chicago Platform why does he not say so? He was present when it was made—he approved it before the people—and he does the same by this letter.

There are

BUT TWO COURSES BEFORE THE COUNTRY:

EITHER to go on and subdue the rebels BY WAR, leaving it to the loyal people of the Southern States to send members to Congress and REORGANIZE THEIR STATES:

OR, to give UP BEAT—ask the REBEL STATES into a convention to RE-ORGANIZE THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT, and to pray them to grant us "TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY" and some sort of a Union on "old foundations,"—with NO HELP FOR IT IF THEY WON'T!

McClellan and Pendleton by THEIR PARTY PLATFORM and EQUALLY BY THEIR LETTERS AND RECORD are PLEDGED to the LATTER COURSE.

I complain that they DECEIVE the people about it. ONE PLAIN HONEST sentence could make it known if they were for the WAR. That word WAR upon which the fate of our country hangs is carefully avoided in all their platforms and letters. The only war they propose is against their own government in the third and fourth Resolutions of their platform.

Our Saviour said:

"Let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is MORE than these COMETH OF EVIL." By this rule nothing could be more surely "OF EVIL," than the "COMMUNICATIONS" of these candidates.

Their art of letter writing is worthy of Macbeth's witches. They palaver about "Union"—"Constitution" and "GOVERNMENT"—and at last even "TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY!" But we find they mean by those words things that the loyal people of the nation would not accept for a moment if they understood them.

"Be those juggling fiends no more believed!
That palter with us in a double sense;
That keep the word of promise to our ear,
But break it to our hope!"

This, the corrupt ambition of Macbeth said TOO LATE. May the pure SPIRIT OF AMERICAN LIBERTY say it IN TIME, and thus escape not only the violence of war—but the GREATER DANGER OF DECEPTION AND TREACHERY AT HOME.

I do not ask you to vote for men or party, as such. This is not a party contest—or, rather, the Union party is now the ONLY support of the great pillars of the Union. Every other election has been trivial, compared with this. The choice is to be made by each one of us, whether we wish that the Nation—the Great Republic—shall live or die.

"Choose well! Your choice
Is BRIEF, yet ENDLESS!"

You choose in a day, the fate of your country for ever!

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 012 028 372 8

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 012 028 372 8

Hollinger
pH 8.5
Mill Run F3-1955